Department-Based Faculty Development and Peer Collaboration:

Developing a preparatory course for English majors

折井麻美子・和氣　一成

キーワード：高等教育、導入科目、ファカルティディベロップメント、内容言語統合型学習、CLIL

【要　旨】本稿は、英語専攻における導入科目の立案・準備・実施について、特にファカルティ・ディベロップメントの観点から論じたものである。英語英文学科では、2016年度より新カリキュラムを開始し、英語による専門科目の受講に必要なアカデミック・スキルの学習と、基礎的な専門知識の習得を並行して行う内容言語統合型学習科目を２科目新設した。本稿では、当該科目の準備・運営にあたり、担当教員に実施した支援や学生による授業評価の結果を報告している。学生授業評価の授業改善への活用の有用性と、教員への継続的な支援の必要性について論じたものである。

Introduction

In today's globalized society, individuals need to communicate across cultural and national boundaries. The English language is now more important as a medium of communication than ever. Undergraduate students who are nonnative speakers of English must have a professional-level command of English by the time they complete their bachelor's degree programs. Undergraduate English language learning programs should therefore offer instruction that meets such social needs and cultivates students' communicative abilities in English, thereby allowing them to function well in various practical situations. The current curriculum at the Department of English Language and Literature, however, has not been changed in over twenty years and has focused on theoretical aspects of English language and on providing students with specialized knowledge of English language and literature. Although we take pride in providing students with this specialized knowledge, the English-teaching faculty has begun to question whether this curriculum presents a barrier to students' acquisition of practical English skills.

In this paper, we discuss faculty development（FD）conducted for developing a university-level content and language integrated learning（CLIL）-based preparatory course for English major students. We first explain that longitudinal department-based FD programs with peer collaboration can lead to improvements in teaching competence, which may result in improved student learning. We further argue that successful FD programs should begin with data about student learning, such as student evaluation, which can be used to provide feedback on teaching and improving program curricula. We then discuss the FD programs administered in the process of developing the course, during the

semester, and after the teaching. Finally, we argue for the need for continued FD to improve teaching content and provide uniformity in the quality of teaching across classes.

1. FD: developments and programs for improving teaching

For several decades, many higher education institutions have recognized the value of FD. Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, and Beach（2006）noted that approaches to FD have evolved over the years in response to changing external expectations for higher education institutions and changing faculty needs（p. xiii）. According to Sorcinelli et al., until the early 1960s, the primary goal of FD programs were to support faculty members' growth as scholars in their specialized fields. From the mid-1960s through 1970s, excellence in not only research but also in teaching and service was advocated, which led to the inclusion of improvement of teaching effectiveness in the program. In the 1980s, a number of FD units emerged formally on campuses to support faculty members in improving their skills as teachers. In the 1990s, many institutions established centers, committees, and other structures to manage a wide range of programs that accommodated a greater range and variety of up-to-date teaching and learning methods. In the new millennium, FD has entered the "Age of [the] Network"（p. 4）, wherein developers face elevated expectations that requires collaborative work with faculty members and other stakeholders in the institution.

One can see how FD has expanded to include a much broader range of concerns by examining the definitions that have been proposed. As early as 1976, FD was defined as "the total development of the faculty member-as a person, as a professional and as a member of an academic community"（Crow, Milton, Moomaw & O'Connel, 1976, p. 3, quoted in Sorcellini, 2006, p. 1）. Two decades later, Lewis（1996）claimed that FD evolved into a more expansive term to encompass the following three key areas: personal development（self-reflection, vitality, and growth）, instructional development（course and student-based initiatives）, and organizational development（program, departmental, and institutional efforts）. Diamond（2002）further argued that these areas were interdependent.

We now examine two surveys conducted with the same research group a decade apart to further analyze the development of FD programs in the 21st century. Sorcinelli et al.（2006）conducted the first large-scale study of faculty developers in North America and Canada. They presented descriptions of the evolution of FD over the last half-century. Furthermore, based on a survey conducted in 2001–2002, a portrait of current developers and programs was presented, and the top challenges they face were discussed based on the results. After 10 years, Beach, Sorcinelli, Austin, and Rivard（2016）conducted yet another large-scale survey and examined the latest developments in the field and identified new and emerging priorities and practices while comparing data with their 2006 study. A total of 385 directors or coordinators of FD centers completed a web-based survey, and 120 participated in follow-up phone interviews exploring the details of their signature programs. The authors found that, as in their 2006 study, new faculty orientation/development was identified as having the highest priority in FD among the top five issues they currently addressed. The next three significant topics were

technology (i.e., integrating technology into traditional teaching), active learning (i.e., promoting active or inquiry-based learning), and assessment (i.e., assessing student learning outcomes). They were reported as issues that remained as the respondents' highest priorities in the 2006 study. Respondents indicated that they were more aggressively addressing the issue of course and curriculum reform than they were a decade ago. The current mean score of the respondents was 3.08, up from a mean of 2.40, making the issue one of the topmost issues FD centers now addressed. The authors argued that this result stemmed from the growing need for including new pedagogical approaches (e.g., technology-mediated or active learning) in the teaching, which called for a curriculum review (pp. 55-57). The one service that developers in all institutions agreed was uniformly important to expand was mid- and senior-career FD. The authors argued that this indicates the urgency of the need to address faculty vitality across the career span (p. 68).

While developers acknowledge the importance of improvement in teaching skills across the career span, what is the recognition of the recipient of the programs? How do faculty members view their teaching and what are their needs from FD programs for improving their teaching skills? While it may be a commonplace notion that faculty members at higher education institutions prioritize their research over teaching, is this still the case?

Beyer, Taylor, and Gillmore (2013) argued that many faculty members devote a significant amount of time to improving their teaching practices, including preparing for classes, grading papers, and meeting with students. Based on the interview data at the University of Washington, Beyer et al. also reported that improvements to teaching competences were often carried out in isolation based on their personal teaching experience.

However, as Condon, Iverson, Manduca, Ruts, and Willett (2016) noted, individual faculties produce "a shallow spiral" when working alone for improvement. They argued that when faculty work together to "design instruments to gather data about their students' learning and then apply data-driven, empirical evidence to change in pedagogy, the spiral lengthens, becomes taller" (p. 6). One can say that when working as a group, this will facilitate the achievements in teaching abilities. For example, Light, Calkins, Luna, and Drane (2009) carried out an empirical study to assess the impact of a year-long FD program designed for junior faculty members and found positive changes in the approaches to teaching the participants. A total of 49 faculty members from a wide range of disciplines completed the development program on four separate occasions. Participants attended monthly dinner workshops over eight months, a two-day retreat, and three to four teaching and learning workshops, and went through consultation meetings with mentors and center faculty. They were also assigned to a project group with two or three other participants, and they met three times with a program facilitator to discuss and critique each other's projects. They analyzed participant' critical reports on teaching, post-program interviews, and results of approaches to teaching inventory (ATI), which is a standardized Likert scale inventory developed to provide a measure of faculty approach to teaching. For ATI, pre- and posttreatment data were compared, and then these two were compared with data obtained

from the control group, which did not take the program. The authors found evidence that participants moved towards more conceptual and student-focused approaches to teaching.

So far, we have discussed that improving faculty teaching competence has become a topic of central attention in FD programs（Beach et al., 2016, Sorcinelli et al., 2006）. We also discussed whether faculties are indeed concerned with their teaching practice, while they tend to work on their skills on their own, which may slow down changes in their teaching practice（Beyer et al., 2013; Condon et al., 2016）. We found that significant improvement in teaching competence can be achieved by a longitudinal formal FD program conducted in groups（Light et al., 2009）.

As illustrated, Light et al.（2009）conducted centrally administered formal FD in their study. However, they also stated that formal FD activity is not the only possible category of developmental activity that may have an impact on teaching. Following Ferman's（2002）claim, they also acknowledged the value of informal collaborative activities such as discussions with peers, informal feedback from colleagues and students, and teaching support networks as useful means in developing their teaching. In this respect, department-based instructional development might have advantages over institutional programs. In the following section, we will examine the benefits of department-based FD programs and the desired features of such programs.

2. Department-based FD programs

Although most research and literature on FD has focused on centrally provided programs, DiLorenzo and Heppner（1994）argued that the departmental administration should take an active role in facilitating FD given that the "professional and social milieu of the academic home has a tremendous effect on the productivity and well-being of faculty members"（p. 485）. Furthermore, developmental activities that occur within departments or disciplines are likely to be more relevant to faculty members' teaching situation, and informal collaboration at workplace is more likely to occur.

This is in line with the experimental study conducted by Quinlan and Akerlind（2000）. They examined departmental peer collaboration as a means of FD and suggested guidelines for conducting such programs. The study reported two different cases of department-based, practice-centered peer inquiry projects, one conducted in a department of history at a struggling state university and the other in a department of mechanical engineering at a prestigious private university. In the history department, the collaboration was structured as a series of independent one-hour teaching circles on several topics of relevance to teaching. Meanwhile, in the mechanical engineering department, seven faculty members volunteered to participate in the project in two divisions in the department. The participants discussed and reviewed courses by drawing on reflective commentaries written by the instructors, reviews of course syllabus and materials, and feedback obtained through group interviews of students. The collaborative experience seems to have had more of an impact on individual mechanical engineering participants than on participants in the history department. This can be attributed to the fact that in the engineering department, participants concentrated on several pieces of actual evidence

of teaching practice in actual contexts (e.g., discussion of specific and personal teaching materials and practices) and maintained a consistent theme or topic in their interactions. The authors also considered visibility, accessibility, and broader participation within the history department, resulting in a broader effect on the entire department.

The department-based collaboration examined by Quinlan and Akerlind (2000) shows the importance of interaction and communication in contributing to a departmental culture and supportive teaching improvement. They suggested that collaboration is likely to succeed if the program is designed and led by committed faculty members within the department, with appropriate administrative support. They also claimed that activities that require faculties to commit to collaboration with a small group over an extended period may have significant impact on their teaching competence. This may also allow time for faculty members to open up to each other. In conclusion, a mixture of approaches may be desirable, such as teaching circles across the department and a subset of the faculty engaged in more committed longitudinal projects.

3. FD and student learning

In the previous sections, we discussed that improving teaching skills has become a main area of FD in the past four decades and that systematically supporting skill development may be desirable for effective teaching skill development. However, improving the teaching ability of faculty members is not our primary objective in conducting FD. Rather, the optimal goal should be to improve student learning. In this section, we will examine whether increased teaching competence will result in improved student learning.

A large-scale longitudinal mixed-methods study by Condon et al. (2016) produced solid research outcomes for attempts to improve teaching and achieve better student learning. The study was conducted on two campuses, Carleton College and Washington State University, in the United States. The study (nicknamed the "Tracer Project") traced the effects of FD on students' learning in terms of critical thinking and writing skills. They categorized three types of FD in their study: formal FD (e.g., workshops, professional conferences, or colloquia), intentional self-directed efforts (e.g., individual efforts for improving their teaching), and routine FD (e.g., annual reviews, summative and informative evaluations of teaching performance, and portfolio assessment). On both campuses, convincing evidence was obtained that learning about teaching through FD leads to improvements to student learning of writing skills. The authors identified several factors that should be considered when carrying out FD. One factor relevant to our study is that short timescales increase the difficulty of measuring the impacts of professional development activities on student learning. We should keep in mind that it takes time for faculty members to incorporate and refine changes in teaching (p. 117). They also pointed out that a successful FD program can begin with obtaining data about student learning, which at least ensures deeper understanding of student learning (p. 119).

One way to obtain feedback from students is end-of-term student evaluation. It has been nearly

two decades since the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology in Japan started to encourage universities to administer student evaluations. Since then, universities nationwide have been conducting student course evaluations in one form or another. Yamaji（2007）noted that although student evaluation is a subjective opinion of students, it can still function as a valuable source for finding points for improvements in classrooms. He emphasized the importance of taking a systematic approach in using student evaluation for FD. Sato, Nakai, Kojima, Shiroma, and Sugitani（2016）further recommended the use of student evaluation for faculty consultation aimed at class improvement.

However, as Mori and Tanabe（2011）argued, the results of such evaluation are often a simple tabulation of scores that is returned to instructors for individual inspection and is rarely examined for teaching improvement. The results of students' ratings are simply tabulated and are not carefully examined. For example, Sekiuchi, Hada, Kuzuo, and Itabashi（2009）conducted a survey to investigate how student evaluation was implemented at universities in the Tohoku area（in the northern part of Japan）. A total of 29 out of 48 universities responded to the questionnaire. The results showed that student evaluation was implemented mainly in general education subjects（96.6%）and specialized subjects that were offered by the university. However, the implementation rate for specialized subjects offered by each department was rather low（37.9%）. Student evaluation was most commonly conducted each semester, and the results of the evaluation were predominantly reported only to faculty members so that they could use it for self-reflection. Very few universities used student evaluation for FD initiatives such as faculty consultation.

Tohoku University is one of the few universities that promotes a plan-do-check-act（PDCA）cycle using student evaluation. Faculty members are required to fill in a teaching report based on student evaluations. They summarize the content of the teaching, explain how they tried to make learning effective, and outline plans for improvement. Evaluating one's own teaching based on standardized data, such as student evaluation, can be one of the means to promote the PDCA cycle in higher education.

Another example of the effective usage of student evaluation for FD was in another university in the Tohoku area. Itabashi（2011）conducted a questionnaire survey at Fukushima University on how student evaluation was used for FD. He found that the majority of faculty members use student evaluation for checking students' understanding of the content and their perception of teaching（e.g., teaching style, clarity of instruction, procedure of class, assignments, handouts, and PPTs）. However, very few faculty members reported opportunities to use the evaluation data for FD as a group. Itabashi also discussed how to make student evaluation more informative. One attempt made by the FD center at Fukushima University was to compile a teaching report that shared classroom experiences and tactics to cope with difficulties in teaching class. Such a teaching report can function as the written form of an FD seminar. Considering the busy schedule of faculty members, FD through written teaching reports can be an effective means of FD.

Mori and Tanabe（2011）also argued that student evaluations should be used to improve the curriculum. At Kinki University, a campus-wide students' course evaluation started in 2008. However,

questionnaire results were returned to instructors for individual inspection and were not analyzed systematically. Their research was informative in that they statistically analyzed the survey results to better understand students' perception of English classes at the school of law.

In section 1, the history and development of FD was discussed, and it was shown that improving teaching competence has become a main area of concern. In section 2, we argued that longitudinal department-based FD programs with peer collaboration can lead to improvements in teaching competence. Moreover, improvement in teaching skills result in improved student learning (section 3), and successful FD programs should begin with data about student learning such as student evaluation. It was also argued that student evaluation should be used to provide feedback on teaching. In the following sections, it is explained how FD was administered in our department to develop a CLIL-based preparatory course.

4. Developing a preparatory course

Overview

In developing the course, we decided to administer all three types of FD discussed in Condon et al. (2016). As formal FD, our department held three workshops concerning CLIL-based teaching. We also conducted group meetings to discuss teaching during the semester. As routine FD, end-of-semester student evaluation, which was designed by the coordinators, was administered. The coordinators analyzed the data with written feedback. We also asked lecturers to fill in a teaching report (i.e., reflection paper), and the data were shared among instructors. As intentional self-directed efforts, the coordinators asked the lecturers to revise the class syllabus each semester based on student evaluations while consulting other lecturers' reflection paper for ideas for improvement.

Designing a new curriculum

In 2012, our department began designing a new curriculum by conducting contextual needs analysis using a survey administered to over 400 students about the current curriculum and potential future curricula. Students who participated in the survey answered 49 questions using a 3-to-5-point Likert scale. Focus group interviews with 36 participants were also conducted. As expected, the results of the questionnaire revealed that most of the students were satisfied with the knowledge they gained in their major, such as teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL), theoretical linguistics, American literature, and British literature. However, the percentage of students who answered that they were either "very satisfied" or "rather satisfied" with their English ability in terms of the four main language learning skills was quite low, with 44.9% satisfied with the skills they had gained in writing, 41.1% satisfied with the skills they had gained in reading, 22.8% satisfied with the skills they had gained in listening, and 20.3% satisfied with the skills they had gained in speaking. It was clear to faculty members that a new curriculum would have to focus specifically on building practical language skills. Given the low rate of satisfaction with our curriculum, faculty members of our department felt a strong

need to build a better program that focused on language skills by increasing the number of classes that emphasized practical competence. For details, see Harada（2017）.

A curriculum working group（WG）was organized in 2013 with eight members from four areas in the department: theoretical linguistics, applied linguistics, British literature, and American literature. The members of the WG included senior and junior members in the department. The WG intensively discussed the content of the new curriculum, such as directions for designing the curriculum, designing new courses, and revising contents for existing courses. Proposals from the WG were then discussed at the departmental meeting, which consisted of 20 full-time tenured faculty members. The members of the WG were actively involved in the curriculum reform, and they organized a two-day retreat for intensive discussion and socializing during summer 2015. The closeness among the members of the WG and members' commitment to the curriculum reform partly contributed to obtaining senior members' understanding for proposed drastic changes to the curriculum. Members of the WG were later appointed as course coordinators of two courses, which were designed to be the main courses in the curriculum, and continued to be actively involved in the management of the new curriculum.

Changes made to the curriculum included the following: the creation of an "elective English skills component," including classes such as Business English, debating skills, preparation for TOEFL, and simultaneous interpretation courses; the creation of a "short overseas study & internship component" to encourage students to gain experience in countries where English is spoken; and an increase in the number of content courses taught in English from four to 40. As for compulsory courses, the content of the academic writing course was extensively revised and was coordinated by two of the WG members. Two preparatory courses to help freshmen acquire the necessary academic skills for English-medium instruction were also created. The WG decided to employ CLIL in conducting the preparatory course, and the two authors of this paper, one specializing in TEFL and the other in American literature, were appointed as coordinators of the course. The rationale behind the course content is explained before we outline the features of the course.

Rationale behind employing CLIL for the preparatory course

In an English as a foreign language（EFL）environment like Japan's, students often lack appropriate and meaningful contexts in which to use English, motivation to use English outside the classroom, and sufficient input to progress in their language learning. They must therefore be provided with an adequate amount of accessible academic content that requires English use in a meaningful context. To be more specific, students need sufficient input（Krashen, 1982）with pushed output（Swain, 1985）and interaction with speakers of the target language（Long, 1983）.

We believe that CLIL is one of the best ways to provide such language-learning experiences for students. CLIL helps maximize students' language input through lectures and reading assignments, facilitates pair and group interactions through discussions of the subject matter, and allows students to have more pushed output. According to Ellis（2000）, pushed output is output that is precise, coherent,

and situationally appropriate, and it can be induced through the performance of cognitively demanding tasks such as academic presentations. Swain (1985) also argued that CLIL classroom promotes collaborative work through cognitively and socially demanding tasks such as discussions.

The two preparatory courses

The CLIL-based two preparatory courses were designed to prepare first-year students for the various English-medium classes that they would take in subsequent academic years by building the academic and English language skills required in such courses. They would also acquire the basic content knowledge needed for the English-medium specialized courses they would take in subsequent academic years.

Students are required to enroll in "Introduction to Language and Communication," a semester-long course on topics of language and communication, as well as a "Introduction to Literature and Culture" course on topics of literature and culture. Students are required to take both courses in their first year, one in the spring semester and the other in the fall semester. Four classes are offered for each course per semester. Which course a student takes first and which class he or she enrolls in depends on the students' scores on a web-based placement test taken in March prior to entering our university. Classes are conducted primarily in English and held in relatively small groups of approximately 17–20 students. Each course has a language learning objective and content learning objective. The target language learning objectives for the "Introduction to Language and Communication" course are improvements to students' listening comprehension skills and presentation skills, while the language learning objectives for the 'Introduction to Literature and Culture' course are improvements to students' reading and presentation skills.

Lecturers are required to include activities to improve the following aspects of students' reading and listening comprehension skills:

(1) predicting content;
(2) understanding the main idea of a text;
(3) understanding logical sequencing;
(4) understanding specific information;
(5) inferencing;
(6) taking notes;
(7) writing an outline; and
(8) giving a summary.

Both courses emphasize the development of students' presentation skills by requiring lecturers to include the following activities:

(1) checking and confirming information;
(2) giving an introduction;
(3) expressing and supporting an opinion;
(4) presenting facts;
(5) giving a summary;
(6) paraphrasing: and
(7) agreeing and disagreeing.

Students are also introduced to basic public speaking skills, including nonverbal communication skills such as posture, gesture, eye contact, and voice quality.

5. Department-based peer collaboration for the preparatory course

Overview

In this section, we discuss the FD programs administered in the process of developing the course, during the semester, and after the teaching. These included the following: (1) *formal FD* was conducted in the form of departmentally administered seminars in the process of developing the course; (2) *group meetings* were held when preparing for the new course and during the semester to discuss the problems instructors faced during the teaching; at the end of the semester, (3) *student evaluation* was conducted to obtain student response toward the teaching; and (4) *reflection papers* were also employed to encourage instructors to reflect on their teaching practices; (5) this was also used for *peer collaboration* by exchanging the reflection papers.

Formal FD

Since most of our faculty members were not familiar with CLIL teaching, the department held three faulty development seminars half a year before we implemented the new preparatory course. The first seminar, held in early November 2015, was led by one of our faculty members who specialized in CLIL. In the first part of the session, a definition of CLIL was given in comparison to English as a medium of instruction (EMI) and content-based instruction. The faculty member then referred to the recent literature on the practical application of the CLIL approach. He also emphasized the importance of balancing content learning and language learning (skills development).

Another seminar was given in late November by an outside lecturer who practiced CLIL using literature. He gave us a 45-minute mini-demo lesson from a CLIL course focusing on Sylvia Plath. He outlined the syllabus, materials, and assessment of his course. The second seminar was a very active lesson full of interactions between the lecturers and students (in this case, faculty members of our department). However, the lesson was rather content centered and had little focus on the language learning aspect.

The third seminar was held in January 2016 by yet another lecturer from outside our university. This seminar was based on a cultural studies course conducted at the English literature department in Tokyo. The lecturer demonstrated how to encourage students to think critically and present their opinions with reason/supporting evidence. This time, the course placed greater emphasis on language development.

The three seminars were extremely beneficial for the faculty members, but we also realized the difficulty of finding a good balance between content learning and language learning. Based on the seminars, we revised the description of the course and decided that our top priority was to improve students' presentations skills than content learning. This was partially because the preparatory course was more or less the only course that students had the opportunity to improve their presentation skills in a relatively small class size. Because we increased the number of content courses instructed in English, we assumed that students could acquire specialized knowledge in literature and language in other EMI courses.

Group meetings

In January 2016, meetings were held separately for the two courses to discuss the details of the courses. The language group decided not to use a textbook and that each lecturer would prepare handouts for content learning based on their specialized fields. This was mainly because lecturers preferred to choose topics on their own and to remain independent from one another in conducting the class. Meanwhile, in the literature group, three out of four lecturers decided to use a standardized textbook so that they could help each other in developing the course. They chose a textbook on critical theory using American short stories for analysis. We also discussed classroom management and decided on a unified class requirement (e.g., minimum number of presentations during the semester, required attendance rate to obtain credits) that should be used in all eight classes.

During the first semester, which started in April 2016, each group met twice during the semester to share experiences and exchanged ideas to improve teaching. For example, lectures shared the difficulties they faced in eliminating the use of the students' first language in class. Students were generally not used to taking classes in English and therefore tended to use Japanese in pair work/discussions. The lecturers themselves tended to allow the use of Japanese for deeper analysis or active participations in discussions. As coordinators of the course, we emphasized the importance of students' production in English for effective pushed output, and lecturers agreed on using less Japanese during class. We discussed how lecturers can support students who are weak in understanding lecturers' instructions in class, and how we can encourage students to use English during pair/group work. Another difficulty lecturers expressed was their difficulty in teaching presentation skills without teaching materials focused on skill development.

Student evaluation as feedback on teaching

A questionnaire was administered in August 2016 in the form of an end-of-semester student evaluation. The purpose of the questionnaire was to examine how students responded to the class and locate places for improvement in teaching. There were 18 questions in a Likert scale format with 6 answer options. Questions were on the following four categories: students' participation in class (i.e., how much effort he or she put into participating in class); students' responses concerning content learning; students' responses concerning language learning; and students' evaluation of the lecturer's teaching. As for the fourth category, questions included whether the lecturer provided sufficient support to understand specialized subjects in the class; whether he or she provided sufficient scaffolding for learning reading/listening and presentation skills; and whether he or she provided effective feedback to students. Below is a list of questions that were included in the analysis of this paper:

Category 1: Students' participation in class

Q3: What is your attendance record for this class?

Q4: Were you actively involved in classroom activities?

Category 2: Students' response concerning content learning

Q5: Did you understand the content matter taught in class?

Q6: Did you find the content matter taught in class interesting?

Category 3: Students' response concerning language learning

Q9: Did you have ample opportunities to speak and make presentations in English?

Q10: Did you have ample opportunities to work in pairs or discuss in groups?

Q11: To what extent did you use English in pair/group work?

Q12: Were you able to learn presentation skills in class?

Category 4: Students' evaluation of the lecturer's teaching

Q7: Did your lecturer provide sufficient support to understand the content matter?

Q8: To what extent did your lecturer use English in class?

Q13: Did your lecturer provide sufficient feedback on your speech/presentation?

The questionnaire was implemented in all eight classes and was presented in Japanese. However, we will exclude one literature class from analysis in this paper. The excluded class（henceforth, the experimental class）was instructed by one of the coordinators（the second author）and included special features, including active/cooperative learning and abundant immediate feedback from the lecturer. The first author collected data from the students and found that the class had an exceptionally high satisfaction rate（Wake & Orii, 2017）compared to the other seven classes. For example, comparison with classes conducted by other lecturers who did not place emphasis on immediate feedback showed less satisfactory responses to the question of whether students were satisfied with the teaching. Because we knew that the experimental class was exceptional, we decided to exclude this class from analysis to see the general tendency of teaching for the course.

A nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted to examine whether the seven classes included in the analysis differed in teaching. We did not conduct post hoc tests to locate which class had significantly lower or higher scores, because we preferred not to rank lecturers during their first semester of teaching a new course. IBM SPSS Statistics 22.0 for Windows was used for analysis. Results showed that students actively participated in the class and exhibited generally high understanding of the content matter, and no statistically significant difference between classes was observed for Q3, Q4, Q5 and Q6.

Meanwhile, students in each class reported differently for the third and fourth categories. There were differences among classes on how lecturers conducted the language learning: there was a difference among class as to what extent the students felt there were ample opportunities to speak and make presentations in English（Q9, $P<0.001$）and to work in pairs and discuss in groups（Q10, $P<0.001$）, and the extent of how much the students used English in class（Q11, $P<0.001$）. They also evaluated differently on whether they could learn presentation skills through participating in the class（Q12, $P<0.001$）. Moreover, students reported differently on their lecturers' teaching: specifically, how much feedback the lecturer provided on his or her speech/presentations（Q13, $P=0.027$）.

In summary, we observed a significant difference between classes, especially on how lecturers conducted their classes in teaching language skills and how much feedback they provided to support students' learning. Next, we discuss how active learning with feedback can facilitate learning and why FD is needed to improve the quality of teaching.

Active/cooperative learning and feedback in the CLIL classroom

A successful CLIL classroom usually employ active learning strategies. As Bonwell and Eison (1991, p. 2) stated in their earlier studies, in active learning classrooms, students are involved in more than listening; in other words, less emphasis is placed on transmission of information, more focus is placed on skills development, and students are engaged in higher-order thinking (e.g., analysis, synthesis, evaluation) through various activities (e.g., reading, discussing, writing). Greater emphasis is also placed on students' exploration of their own attitudes and values.

Furthermore, cooperative learning strategies (Johnson, Johnson & Smith, 1991; Nan, 2014) and active learning through group work can further facilitate students' interaction in English. According to Johnson, Johnson, and Smith (1991), cooperative learning is the "instructional use of small groups so that students work together to maximize their own and each other's learning." Cooperative learning not only induces task-based interaction but also motivates learners to participate more actively in given tasks. Working in groups can also motivate learners to study autonomously so that they can meet the expectations of their group members.

Moreover, numerous studies have shown that providing students with feedback can greatly enhance their learning and improve their language acquisition (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Unfortunately, studies still disagree on the optimum timing and means of providing feedback. For example, Metcalfe, Kornell, and Finn (2009) found that college students learning GRE-level vocabulary benefitted more from delayed feedback than they did from immediate feedback. However, Woods (2015) found that immediate formative assessment feedback showed a significant increase in reading comprehension ability. Whether the feedback is provided immediately or delayed, we noticed the need to strongly encourage lecturers to provide feedback on students' production.

In the context of higher education, however, traditional one-way lecture methods still dominate classrooms to a certain degree, and employing active and cooperative learning along with feedback provision on students' performance may not occur naturally. As coordinators of the course, we felt a strong need for continued FD to improve the quality of teaching. Because lecturers have relatively less experience in teaching practical language skills compared to teaching specialized knowledge, we also acknowledged the need to provide teaching materials for teaching academic presentations. Next, we will present peer collaboration activities that we administered during the academic year 2016 and our FD plans for the next two years.

Reflection paper and peer collaboration

At the end of the academic year 2016, all lecturers completed a critical report on teaching in the form of a reflection paper. Smith and Tillema（2001）identified two main uses of a teaching portfolio（in their term）: for self-assessment and evaluation of one's teaching practice, and a tool for sharing resources and strategies in teaching practice. They answered questions concerning their teaching on content and skill learning. The report offered an opportunity for a reflective, critical account of the implementation of teaching and planning for future teaching. Lecturers were asked to address the following areas: general description of their teaching and techniques implemented to improve students' presentation skills. They were also asked to comment on areas that they felt were successful in improving their students' ability and on how they conducted the teaching, and on areas where they were not able to improve students' ability. We made sure that the reflection paper did not become a "success report" showing their high competencies. When the form was sent out via e-mail, we made clear that it was intended for sharing experiences in the classroom to improve teaching competence as a group. We also encouraged lecturers to write about the difficulties they experienced in their teaching. The first author completed her paper beforehand and presented it as a model that focused on exhibiting her weak points in teaching and outlining areas for improvement. The papers submitted by the lecturers were sent to all participants without their names on the paper for peer collaboration.

Peer collaboration in 2017 and future directions

Before the commencement of the second year of the course, we revised the guidelines for writing the syllabus and emphasized the importance of explicitly teaching presentation skills. We also asked the lecturers to provide feedback either orally or in a written form to the students. We also revised the questions of the end-of-term evaluation so that students could specify the type of feedback they received and how much they appreciated the feedback. We also asked lecturers to complete reflection papers of their teaching at the end of the first semester so that they could revise their teaching before the second semester of the year. Written comments from the lecturers showed that peer collaboration had a positive effect on their teaching. Others expressed hope for more face-to-face opportunities to discuss teaching experiences during the semester. Based on the suggestions, we intend to organize course meetings so that lecturers of the two courses can discuss problems together. Given that the lecturers who teach the two courses may change due to retirement and/or new employment, as well as exchanges of courses among faculty members, we feel the strong need to continuously support lecturers in conducting the course. Currently, coordinators are compiling useful expressions and preparing a textbook on presentations and discussion skills. The first draft will be revised based on discussions with other lecturers. It will be used in class from the autumn semester of 2018.

As Quinlan and Akerlind（2000）discussed, department-based collaboration requires intensive interactions and communication among participants and trust and mutual respect, which take time to develop. Moreover, as Condon et al.（2016）discussed based on their tracer project, it takes time

for faculty to incorporate changes in teaching. It is not easy to refine one's teaching from the familiar content-oriented teaching to skills-oriented ones to accommodate students' needs. We hope to be able to provide further data to evaluate the development of the course through student production data in the future.

6. Conclusions

In the first half of the paper, we discussed that improving teaching competence of faculties has become a central issue in FD programs. We also discussed that faculties are indeed concerned with their teaching practice even though they tend to work on their own, which may slow down changes to their teaching practice. We observed that significant improvements in teaching competence can be achieved by a longitudinal formal FD program conducted in groups. We also showed that department-based peer collaboration can have a significant impact on teaching competence. We further argued that obtaining student course evaluation data can be a valuable source for reflection on one's teaching.

In the second part of the paper, we discussed the process of designing, developing, and conducting a university-level CLIL-based preparatory course for English major students. FD administered in the process of developing the course, during the semester, and after the teaching were illustrated. We argued for the need for continued FD in the form of peer collaboration to improve the content of the teaching to provide uniformity in the quality of teaching across classes.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B) [15H03228]. The authors thank T. Harada for sharing his professional knowledge on CLIL; Y. Sawaki for her support in administrating the courses; and S. Sugita for helping us with the data analysis. Our heartfelt appreciation goes to the anonymous reviewer who provided us with a number of insightful comments that helped to improve the content of our paper. We would also like to thank the lecturers and students for their contribution to the study.

References

Beach, A. L., Sorcinelli, M. D., Austin, A. E., & Rivard, J. K. (2016). *Faculty Development in the Age of Evidence*. Sterling, Virginia: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Beyer, C. H., Taylor, E., & Gillmore, G. M. (2013). *Inside the Undergraduate Teaching Experience. The university of Washington's Growth in Faculty Teaching Study.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Bonwell, C. C. & Eison, J. A. (1991). *Active Learning: Creating Excitement in the Classroom.* Washington, DC: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report.

Condon, W., Iverson, E. R. Manduca, C. A., Rutz, C., & Willett, G. (2016). *Faculty Development and Student Learning.* Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Crow, M. L., Milton, O., Moomaw, W. E., & O'Connell, W. R. (1976). *Faculty Development Centers in Southern Universities.* Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No.

ED129132).

Diamond, R. M. (2002). Faculty, instructional, and organizational development: options and choices. In K. H. Gillespie, L. R. Hilsen, & E. C. Wadsworth. (Eds.) *A Guide to Faculty Development: Practical Advice, Examples, and Resources.* Bolton, MA: Anker.

DiLorenzo, T. M. & Heppner, P. P. (1994). The role of an academic department in promoting faculty development: recognizing diversity and leading to excellence. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 72, 5, 485-491.

Ellis, R. (2000). *Learning a Second Language Through Interaction.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub Co.

Ferman, T. (2002). Academic professional development practice: what lecturers find valuable. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 7, 2, 146-158.

Gillespie, K. J. & Robertson, D. L (2010). *A Guide to Faculty Development*, Second Edition. San Francisco, CA.: Josey Bass A Willey Imprint.

Harada, T. (2017). Developing a content-based English as a foreign language program: needs analysis and curriculum design at the university level. In M. A. Snow & D. M . Brinton. (Eds.) *The Content-Based Classroom.* The University of Michigan Press.

Hattie, J. & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77, 1, 81-112.

Itabashi, T. (2011). Awareness Survey on student's course evaluation questionnaire. *Proceedings of Center for Research and Development of Education. Fukushima University*, 10, 7-14.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. (1991). *Active Learning: Cooperation in the College Classroom.* Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.

Lewis, K. G. (1996). A brief history and overview of faculty development in the United States. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 1, 2, 26-33.

Light, G., Calkins, S., Luna, M., & Drane, D. (2009). Assessing the impact of a year-long faculty development program on faculty approaches to teaching. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 20, 168-181.

Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 126-141.

Metcalfe, J., Kornell, N., & Finn, B. (2009). Delayed versus immediate feedback in children's and adults' vocabulary learning. *Memory & Cognition*, 37, 1077-1087.

Mori, S. & Tanabe, Y. (2011). Students' course evaluations and their roles in faculty development (2): analysis of students' perceptions toward required English classes. *Kinki University English Journal*, 7, 17-36.

Nan, H. (2014). A feasible study on cooperative learning in large class college English teaching. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4, 1862-1868.

Quinlan, K. M. & Akerlind, G. S. (2000). Factors affecting departmental peer collaboration for faculty development: two cases in context. *Higher Education*, 40, 23-52.

Sato, H., Nakai, T., Kojima, S., Shiroma, S., & Sugitani, Y. (2016). *Handbook for Faculty Development.* Tokyo: Tamagawa University Press.

Sekiuchi, T., Hada, T., Kuzuo, M., & Itabashi, T. (2009). The present situation and challenges concerning "course evaluation by students": based on the investigation into universities and colleges in Tohoku Region. Institute for Excellence in Higher Education, *Tohoku University Departmental Bulletin Paper*, 4, 133-146.

Smith, K. & Tillema, S. (2001). Long-term influences of portfolios on professional development. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 455, 2, 183-203.

Sorcinelli, M. D., Austin, A. E., Eddy, P. L., & Beach, A. L. (2006). *Creating the Future of Faculty Development*. San Francisco, CA: Kpssey-Bass A Wiley Imprint.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. Madden. (Eds.) *Input and Second Language Acquisition*. Rowleby, MA: Newbury House.

Wake, I. & Orii, M. (2017). Using critical theory and American literary works to improve university-level English presentation skills through active and cooperative learning strategies. *English Phonetics* (*Journal of EPSJ*), 21, 335-347.

Woods, J. (2015). *Does Formative Assessment with Immediate Feedback Impact Reading Comprehension.* Createspace Independent Publishing Platform.

Yamagi, H. (2007). *Handbook of Student Evaluation of Teaching.* Tamagawa University Press.